Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/801,944	STROM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Paresh Patel	2829
All Participants:	Status of Application	ı:
(1) <u>Paresh Patel</u> .	(3)	·
(2) Anthony G. Smyth.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 16 February 2007	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	·
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:	·	
1		·
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. T of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summation 	he examiner will provide a record of the substance of	written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
	•	
	,	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applica	nt/Applicant's Representati	ve Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On 02/12/2006, the Examiner called Mr. Smyth to overcome 35 USC 101 issue (which brought up during conference for Appeal Brief that was filed on 10/30/2006) and for possible allowance with amendment to independent claims (to overcome the Harris reference). Examiner suggested a language i.e. calculating probe float by subtracting results of said acquiring from said obtaining for claim 1 and similar language for other independent claims. Mr. Smyth consulted the client, later on 02/16/2006 the Examiner was informed that the reference Harris does not disclose method steps of claim 1. Regarding 35 USC 101 issue, Mr. Smyth requested an office action.